

UNIVERSAL DESIGN COMMITTEE
Division of the State Architect Advisory Board

Minutes of Public Meeting
Monday, June 14, and Tuesday, June 15, 2004

Holiday Inn
300 J Street, Fresno Conference Room
Sacramento, California

Committee Members Present

John Paul Scott, Chair
Pete Guisasola
Chris Lawrence
Peter Margen (via teleconference)
Ron Mincer (via teleconference, 6/15 only)
Bob Nicol
Pete Peterson
Richard Skaff (via teleconference)
Sharon Toji

Committee Members Absent

Gale Bate
Ron Mincer (absent 6/14 only)
Mike Modugno
Amor Taylor

DSA Staff Present

Mary Ann Aguayo (6/15 only)
Linda Huber
Michael Mankin
Aaron Noble
Dan Rasmussen
Louise Redeen
Terry Salo
Derek M. Shaw
Elena Tarailo
John Vester

Others Present

Jim Abrams, CA Hotel & Lodging Assn.
(6/14 only)
David Adams, Robertson Industries
(6/15 only)
Terry Dudgeon, Sign Effects, Inc.
(6/15 only)
Bill Englund, Englund Designworks
(6/15 only)
Ken Ethridge, ASI-Modulex (6/15 only)
Meg Faye, Fayeworks Design
Glenn Gall, OSHPD (6/15 only)
Jennifer Gibson, Weidner Architecture
Signage (6/15 only)
Donn Harter, CA Glass Association
Eugene Lozano, California
Council of the Blind
David J. Martinez, CALBO
George Moore, Californians for
Disability Rights (6/14 only)
Greg Moore, Golden State Vanguard
Stephen H. Moore, Ellis & Ellis (6/15
only)
Steven Musillami, CA State Parks
Noel Nudeck (via teleconference 6/14)
Michael Paravagna, DOR (6/14 only)
Kyle Reath, Ellipsis (6/15 only)
David Spease landscape architect (6/15)
Michelle Savage, CART captioner

Call to Order and Introductions

Committee Chair John Paul Scott called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m. on June 14, 2004, and welcomed everyone. He noted this meeting was a continuation of the May 26 session, as the committee was unable to process all of agenda items.

Mr. Scott noted the two-day meeting would be conducted according to Robert's Rules of Order with formal motions, seconds, and votes on each action item. He suggested starting with staff presentations on proposed changes to Chapter 11, followed by committee discussion, and then comments from members of the public. He asked participants to identify themselves before providing their comments, and requested that

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).

people limit their remarks to two minutes.

Participants took turns introducing themselves.

Mr. Scott noted that at the May 26 meeting, the committee agreed to hold off on discussing substantive issues regarding signage until the morning of June 15.

Mr. Richard Skaff asked when the minutes of the last meeting would be approved. Mr. Scott suggested deferring action on the minutes of the May meeting until June 15.

Noting that approval of the minutes was not listed on the meeting agenda, Mr. John Vester proposed accepting the minutes as part of "New Business." Mr. Skaff recommended including approval of the minutes as a standard item on all future agendas.

2004 Code Adoption Cycle - Express Terms and Statement of Reasons
Non-Substantive Changes

Mr. Scott drew attention to the document entitled "Revised Non-Substantive Proposed Code Changes, 2004 Code Cycle." He suggested dealing with non-substantive changes as a block, and setting aside substantive issues for further consideration later in the meeting.

Mr. Peter Margen asked if the committee was using the same set of documents as those presented at the May 26 meeting. Ms. Linda Huber responded that the staff revised some of the language and produced a new set of proposed code changes. She added that there had been no changes to the non-substantive provisions. Mr. Vester said the revised set of documents was posted on the DSA Website.

Ms. Sharon Toji asked when the staff would be providing the committee with reference materials, such as the latest version of Title 24. Mr. Vester stated that the cover memo included in the packet for this meeting directed committee members to a link to the Website. He said staff was still working on compiling materials for committee members' binders.

Ms. Huber said that after DSA released the meeting materials, the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) pointed out that a cross-reference to a Chapter 11A section had been inadvertently omitted. She noted that in the definition of "publicly funded," the cross-reference to Section 1102A.16-P should be corrected to 1107A.16-P to reflect the new numbering system.

Ms. Huber reviewed the proposed non-substantive changes to definitions and cross-references in Sections 217-P, 219-R, 220-S, 221-T, 223-V, and 224-W.

Ms. Huber then reviewed the proposed non-substantive changes to cross-references in Chapter 10, "Means of Egress."

Ms. Huber pointed out the proposed changes Section 1003.3.1.8, "Type of lock or latch." She noted the DSA/AC acronym is being inserted, and the note is being eliminated.

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).

Mr. Skaff observed that eliminating the note could be construed as a substantive change that could have a negative impact. He suggested pulling this item for further review, and other committee members agreed.

Ms. Huber reviewed proposed non-substantive changes to Sections 1003.3.1.10, "Special Egress-Control Devices" and 1003.3.3.13.1, "Tactile Stair Level Identification Sign".

Ms. Huber discussed proposed changes to Section 1003.3.4.4, "Landings." Mr. Skaff commented that by retaining the landing provisions in that section, it might be confusing to inspectors. Because this change could have substantive implications, he recommended pulling it for further consideration.

Ms. Huber reviewed the proposed change to Section 1005.1 "General".

Ms. Huber discussed the proposed non-substantive changes to Sections 1102B "Definitions", 1103B "General", and 1104B.4.3, "Participation Areas".

Committee members questioned whether the proposed change to Section 1104.B.5#8 would allow aisles as narrow as 24 inches. Mr. Skaff said employee routes must be a minimum of 36 inches. Mr. Scott proposed pulling this change for further review.

Ms. Huber reviewed proposed changes to Section 1105B, "Accessibility for Group B Occupancies", 1106B "Accessibility for Group E Occupancies", 1107B "Factories and Warehouses", 1108B "Accessibility for Group H Occupancies", 1111B "Kitchen Facilities", and 1114B "General".

Mr. Scott recommended accepting all the changes correcting the paragraph numbering in Chapter 11A.

Ms. Huber discussed the non-substantive changes to Section 1115B.2.1 "Accessible Water Closets", 1115B.2.1.1.1 "Urinals...", 1115B.2.1.3 "Accessible Showers", 1115B.2.1.4 "Accessible Bath Tubs", 1115B.2.1.5.3 "Accessible Drinking Fountains".

With respect to the changes proposed for Section 1115B.2.1.6.1, "Accessible Kitchen Sinks," 1115B.2.1.6.2 "Noncommercial Kitchens and Counter Bar Sinks," 1115B.5 "Identification Symbols & Table 1115B-1," 1115B.6.2.4.4. "Floor Slope," Mr. Pete Peterson noted the third sentence, pertaining to lever-operated controls, was confusing. Mr. Michael Mankin commented that code provisions are usually written in positive rather than negative language. He agreed the sentence was cumbersome as written. Committee members agreed to pull this provision for further review.

Looking at Section 1115B.2.1.6.2 "Noncommercial Kitchen and Counter Bar Sinks," last sentence, Ms. Toji questioned whether a comma should be placed after the word "building." Committee members decided the comma should be deleted.

Mr. Skaff asked whether DSA intended to give the diagrams in Title 24 any legal force. Mr. Scott noted that issue is for the courts to decide. He said ADAAG diagrams have no legal force and are intended to provide dimensional information. Mr. Scott proposed that this policy issue should be discussed later in the meeting during "New Business".

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).

Ms. Huber reviewed the proposed non-substantive changes to Section 1116B.1.4, "Door Size," 1116B.1.8 Car Inside," 1116B.2 "Special Access (Wheelchair) Lifts".

Mr. Skaff noted elimination of the exception pertaining to Section 1116B.1.4, "Door Size" could be substantive. Mr. Scott observed that this provision would be more appropriate under Section 1134B because it applies to "Accessibility for Existing Buildings". Committee members agreed to pull this item for further discussion.

Committee members reviewed the proposed change to Section 1116B.1.8 "Car Inside". Mr. Skaff directed the committee to the section that clarifies the type of hardware allowed and suggested pulling this section for further review.

Ms. Huber reviewed proposed non-substantive changes to Section 1117B.1 "Water Fountain (General), 1117B.1.2 "Alcoves," 1117B.2.9.3 "Signage," 1117B.3 "Kitchens," 1117B "Mounting Location and Height," 1117B.5.11.2 "Conditions of Use," 1117B.6 "Controls and Operating Mechanisms".

Mr. Chris Lawrence expressed his opinion that the proposed revision to Section 1117B.5.7, "Mounting location and height," constituted a substantive change. Mr. Skaff pointed out that eliminating the word "outside" could result in latches being installed inside. He recommended leaving the word "outside" and adding "in front of latch side." Committee members agreed to pull this item.

Mr. Skaff noted that to be consistent, the abbreviation "lbf." should be used instead of "pounds of force" in Section 1117B.6#4, "Operation". Mr. Scott suggested further discussion on this item.

Ms. Huber stated that Exception 5 should not be deleted from Section 1117B.7.2, "Automated Teller Machines and Point of Sale Machines (General)."

Ms. Huber reviewed the proposed non-substantive changes to Sections 1118B "Space Allowance and Reach Ranges," 1120 "Floors and Levels," 1127B "Exterior Routes of Travel," 1128B "Pedestrian Grade Separations (overpasses and underpasses)," 1130B "Parking Structures", and 1133B "General Accessibility for Entrances, Exits, and Paths of Travel."

Mr. Scott noted Section 1133B.5.7 "Ramps more..." talks about guardrails, and he suggested the technical requirements for guardrails should be provided. Mr. Noble said the guardrail requirements are spelled out in Section 1133B.5.7.3 "Height".

Mr. Scott questioned the derivation of the 4.16% figure specified in Section 1133B.7.1.3 "Surface Cross Slope". He suggested pulling that provision for further review.

Ms. Huber reviewed the proposed non-substantive changes to Sections 1134B "Accessibility for Existing Buildings."

Mr. Aaron Noble discussed the proposed changes to the figures in Chapter 11B. Mr. Scott noted the actual diagrams were included in the meeting packet after the substantive changes.

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).

Ms. Toji questioned use of the word “stall” in Figure 11B-1A. She suggested using “room” instead. Mr. Noble noted “compartment” might be clearer. Mr. Scott recommended pulling this item for further discussion.

Mr. Noble said another proposed change to Figure 11B-1A entails amending cross-references to 36” and 42” minimum for grab bars. Mr. Scott observed that the diagrams were inconsistent with those measurements. He suggested further discussion on this point.

Mr. Noble reviewed the proposed changes to Figures 11B-1B “Multiple Accomodation Toilet”, 11B-1D “Knee Clearance” and 11B-2A “Roll-in Shower.” Mr. Scott suggested changing Figure 11B-2A “Roll-in Shower” to show the same kind of dashed box for the single-lever mixing valve control as in other figures. He recommended pulling this item.

Mr. Noble pointed out the proposed changes to Figure 11B-2B “Roll-in Shower”. Mr. Peterson noted the abbreviations “min.” and “max.” should be moved above the line indicating the 42” and 24” widths.

Mr. Noble discussed the proposed revisions to the titles of Figures 11B-2C “Open Shower,” 11B-14A “International Symbol of Access for Hearing Impaired”, 11B-14B “ISOA Hearing Impaired”, and 11B-14C “ISOA Hearing Impaired”. Mr. Skaff asked why the word “international” was being deleted from Figure 11B-14B. Ms. Toji explained that the volume control symbol is not considered international. Mr. Skaff recommended pulling these items for further clarification.

Mr. Noble reviewed the proposed changes to Figure 11B-18A “Double Parking Stalls”. Mr. Skaff recommended showing a dark background for the “No parking” sign on Figures 11B-18A “Double Parking Stalls”, 11B-18B “Single Parking Stalls”, and 11B-18C “Diagonal Parking Stalls”. He also noted the orientation of the sign should be clarified. Mr. Scott suggested pulling these items for further discussion.

Mr. Noble drew attention to the diagrams of curb cut details, Figures 11B-20A “Curb Detail-Cases A and B”, 11B-20B, “Curb Detail-Cases C and D”, 11B-20C “Curb Detail-Cases E and F”, and 11B-20D “Curb Detail-Cases G and H”. Mr. Skaff commented that some of the revisions could be considered substantive. Mr. Scott noted this entire section was pulled for further discussion at the last meeting.

Mr. Scott noted Figures 11B-23A “Truncated Domes” and 11B-21 “Returned Curb Style” should also be pulled. Mr. Skaff suggested pulling the reference drawings as well. Mr. Scott observed that the reference to 1127B.5#9 should be pulled with that group also.

Motion #1: Mr. Skaff made a motion, seconded by Ms. Toji, to approve all the non-substantive changes discussed up to this point, with the exception of those identified by the committee that necessitate further discussion. The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Noble reviewed the proposed non-substantive changes to Section 1101C “Card-Reader Devices at Fuel Dispensing Equipment”; Part 2, Chapter 30 “Elevators, Dumbwaiters, Escalators and Moving Walks; and Part 3, Article 406 “Receptacles, Cord Connectors, and Attachment Plugs (caps)”.

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).

Mr. Skaff asked why the four exceptions were being added to Section 403.3(G) "Installation Heights". Ms. Huber explained that the provisions were placed in an incorrect section when the new code was published, so they were being moved to the appropriate location. She added that there were no changes to the language contained in the exceptions.

Motion #2: Mr. Skaff made a motion, seconded by Mr. Lawrence, to approve the non-substantive changes to Section 1101C, Chapter 30, and Article 406 as proposed. The motion was carried unanimously.

Ms. Huber said the proposed revisions to the Plumbing Code were considered non-substantive also and suggested reviewing those items next.

Mr. Scott noted the proposed changes to the Plumbing Code were included in the May 26 meeting packet. Ms. Huber directed the committee's attention to the "Express Terms" document.

Ms. Huber reviewed the proposed non-substantive changes to Sections 101.8 "Format", 203.0 "Accessibility", and Chapter 3 "General Regulations".

Ms. Huber discussed the proposed additions to the introductory paragraphs for Table 4-1 "Minimum Plumbing Facilities" and reviewed the proposed additional note to Table 4-1. Mr. Scott said he still found the language confusing.

Mr. Scott recommended specifying which year of the ICC ANSI A117.1 standard was being cited as a reference in the first paragraph for Table 4-1. After some discussion, he proposed deleting the parenthetical statement "For DSA/AC ICC ANSI A117.1." Mr. Scott also noted the last sentence should be revised to say "shall be used" rather than "may be used." Mr. Mankin agreed. Ms. Huber read the revised paragraph which included those changes.

Mr. Margen questioned the use of the term "physically handicapped" and suggested using "persons with disabilities" instead.

Mr. Pete Guisasola recommended leaving the model code language as written and adding a new stand-alone paragraph below it.

Ms. Toji expressed her opinion that the code should not have any provisions that are inconsistent with current law regarding accessibility.

Mr. Margen supported the approach recommended by Mr. Guisasola. Other committee members agreed.

Mr. Scott noted the consensus of the committee was to leave the first paragraph as originally written. He then proposed that the following language be added in a separate paragraph: "For DSA/AC, requirements for persons with disabilities, CCR, Title 24, Part 2, Chapters 11A and 11B shall be used."

After some discussion, the committee referred the introductory paragraphs back to the DSA staff for revision.

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).

Mr. Scott drew attention to the introductory note proposed for Tables 4-2, 4-3, and 4-4. Mr. Peterson noted the word “application” should be changed to “applications.” Committee members observed that the “applications” mentioned are HCD applications rather than DSA applications. Mr. Scott pointed out that the correct sections would be 101.17.9 through 101.17.11 rather than 101.11.9.

Mr. Mankin commented that some of the fixture count applications in the code were intended to be limited to major public event centers, but the code does not clearly state that schools and other types of facilities are excluded.

Mr. Scott proposed sending the entire plumbing section back to the staff for further consideration and noted the substantive changes would be addressed after the lunch break.

At 12:30 p.m., the committee recessed for lunch. Mr. Scott reconvened the meeting at 1:45 p.m.

Future of UDC Task Groups

Mr. Scott reported that the DSA Advisory Board’s Policies and Procedures Committee met and developed recommendations regarding the composition and operation of the Universal Design Committee. He noted the recommendations will be presented to the DSA Advisory Board at its June 18 meeting.

Mr. Scott said he will meet with Board Chair Lowell Shields to discuss the role and function of the task groups.

Mr. Vester pointed out that the committee’s activities will be addressed under Item 4 of the DSA Advisory Board’s agenda for June 18.

2004 Code Adoption Cycle - Express Terms and Statement of Reasons
(Continued)

Substantive Changes

Mr. Scott suggested that the committee deal with substantive items that were previously pulled.

First, Mr. Scott drew attention to Section 1003.3.1.8 “Type of Lock or Latch”, eliminating a DSA note regarding “bars, grilles, grates, or similar devices...” Committee members agreed to wait until Mr. Skaff joined the conversation to address this item.

Mr. Scott noted the next substantive item was Section 1003.3.4.4, “Landings.” He said committee members questioned the inclusion of dimensions for landings and door clearances that were not permitted under Chapter 11B. Mr. Mankin said that when the staff separated access and egress issues, there were some issues that were deemed more appropriate for Chapter 10, but all the access-only provisions were moved to Chapter 11B. Mr. Scott pointed out that the proposed addition highlights the fact that the dimensions were “not adopted by DSA/AC.”

Mr. Guisasola stated that the State Fire Marshal had adopted the entire chapter of the code. He suggested leaving the code language intact, and drafting amendments to clarify differences.

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).

Mr. Scott recommended approving the changes as proposed.

Motion #3: Mr. Guisasola made a motion, seconded by Mr. Peterson, to accept the proposed amendment to Section 1003.3.4.4. The motion was carried unanimously.

Committee members reviewed the proposed change in references to Section 1004B.5 # 8, regarding "Food Preparation Area." Mr. Scott reported that he checked the language and determined the proposed language would allow 36" and 44" aisles, which were safe and acceptable conditions and recommended approval.

Motion #4: Mr. Lawrence made a motion, seconded by Mr. Peterson, to accept the proposed amendment to Section 1004B.5#8. The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Scott welcomed Mr. Skaff back to the conversation and apprised him of the committee's actions on Sections 1003.3.4.4 "Landings" and 1004.B.5# 8 "Food Preparation Area".

Mr. Skaff proposed adding a note clarifying the Section 1004.B.5#8: "Note: (For DSA/AC) Paragraphs 1004.3.2.1 and 1004.3.2.2 are not adopted by DSA/AC." Mr. Scott asked the staff to take care of the editorial changes.

Mr. Scott directed the committee's attention to the proposed amendment for Section 1115.B2.1.6.1 "Accessible Kitchen Sinks", and the third sentence, saying, "Lever-operated controls shall be no greater than 5 lbs." He suggested simply referencing Section 1117B.6, which covers "Controls and Operating Mechanisms," and including faucets in that category. Mr. Margen agreed with Mr. Scott's suggestion.

Committee members concluded that the third sentence was redundant and should be deleted.

Ms. Toji questioned whether the previous sentence should read "be not greater than" or "be no greater than." Committee members decided not to change that sentence.

Motion #5: Mr. Lawrence made a motion, seconded by Mr. Guisasola, to accept the proposed revision, with deletion of the third sentence. The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Scott drew attention to the proposed amendment for Section 1117B.5.7, "Mounting location and height." Ms. Toji said the original language and the terminology used by the federal government is "latch side of the door," and she recommended avoiding use of the term "outside" or "inside." She added that the best solution for blind people would be a tactile exit sign adjacent to a door.

Mr. Skaff agreed with Ms. Toji regarding the language, but noted that sign placement needs to be clarified.

Mr. Peterson pointed out the provisions apply to permanent signage rather than fire exit signs.

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).

Mr. Scott noted it would be helpful if DSA developed a policy on signage locations.

Mr. Mankin commented that this issue usually arises as a person approaches or enters a room or facility, except when it applies to exit-only situations. He suggested adding a note clarifying that the identification sign should be used on the approach route, or on both sides if an exit is also used as an entrance.

Motion #6: Mr. Skaff made a motion, seconded by Ms. Toji, to accept the proposed amendment, with an additional note clarifying that signs should face the approach.

Ms. Toji suggested drafting language for the committee to consider the following day. Mr. Scott asked Ms. Toji to consult with the CART captioner for Mr. Mankin's language and provide a draft for the committee's consideration.

Mr. Skaff withdrew his motion and said he would make a new motion after hearing and discussing the new language. He asked Ms. Toji to call him to draft the proposed language.

Mr. Scott drew the committee's attention to the proposed amendment for Section 1003.3.1.8 "Type of Lock or Latch". Mr. Skaff noted that a recurring issue comes up with elevator emergency control panel doors and recommended clarifying that loops or lever hardware are acceptable.

Mr. Scott pointed out that Mr. Skaff's concern goes beyond the proposed amendment. He recommended considering Mr. Skaff's comment as a new proposal rather than as a part of the amendment package.

Mr. Scott noted that Mr. Ron Mincer also raised a number of other new items in his e mail. Mr. Mankin and Mr. Noble advised that new issues should be placed on a separate list that can be considered later.

Mr. Scott recommended accepting the proposed revision to Section 1003.3.1.8.

Motion #7: Mr. Lawrence made a motion, seconded by Mr. Guisasola, to accept the proposed amendment to Section 1003.3.1.8. The motion was carried unanimously.

Committee members reviewed the proposed amendment to Section 1116B.1.4, the exception to "Door Size".

Mr. Noble said the elevator door requirements were originally included in Chapter 30, and at that time, the model code recognized an exception for a smaller opening. When the Chapter 30 text was moved to Chapter 1116B, this section was inadvertently moved over as well, but the exception does not exist. Mr. Noble and Mr. Margen recommended elimination of the exception.

Motion #8: Mr. Skaff made a motion, seconded by Ms. Toji, to accept the proposed amendment to Section 1116B.1.4. The motion was carried unanimously.

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).

Mr. Scott drew the committee's attention to Section 1116B.1.8, "Car Inside." Mr. Scott noted the correct reference should be Chapter 11B, where the hardware provisions are defined. Mr. Noble suggested changing the language to specify "lever-type hardware or other hardware not requiring an ability to grasp."

Motion #9: Mr. Skaff made a motion, seconded by Mr. Guisasola, to refer this section back to the staff for further review. The motion was carried unanimously.

Committee members agreed that the reference cited in Section 1116B.1.8 should be changed to Section 1117B.6.

Motion #10: Mr. Lawrence made a motion, seconded by Mr. Skaff, to change the reference as proposed.

Mr. Skaff recommended inserting a reference in Chapter 10 to the correct provisions in Chapter 11B.

Ms. Toji said that when inspections are done in the field, fire access provisions are considered separately from accessibility, and fire and building code inspections are not consistent. She emphasized the importance of adding a reference in Chapter 10 to guide inspectors to Chapter 11B they understand there should be an overlay in the standards.

Ms. Toji proposed a friendly amendment, seconded by Mr. Skaff, to add a reference to Chapter 11B as proposed.

Mr. Scott asked the proponents of the motion to put the recommendation in writing for the group to consider the following day.

Mr. Scott proposed the following additional clarification: "If the telephone system is located in a closed compartment, the compartment door hardware shall be a type conforming to the provisions of Section 1117B.6 and shall be operable without the use of a key or any special knowledge or effort."

The maker and seconder of the motion agreed to this revision.

The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Scott noted Mr. Guisasola was leaving the meeting. He clarified that as long as the meeting started with a quorum, it could continue if members left. Mr. Skaff asked if voting could take place, and Mr. Scott confirmed that the remaining members could vote.

Referring to Section 1117B.6#4 "Operation", committee members noted "pounds of force" should be changed to "lbf."

Mr. Scott drew attention to Section 1133B.7.1.3, "Surface cross slopes" and recommended clarifying the percentage figure. Mr. Noble explained the calculation. Mr. Skaff expressed his opinion that the 4.16% slope should be noted as an exception, and would not be allowed under ADAAG or federal programs. Mr. Skaff recommended

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).

writing the second portion as an exception rather than as part of this paragraph. Mr. Scott agreed.

Mr. Skaff proposed sending this section back to the DSA staff for further review. He expressed concern about conflicting with ADAAG and federal standards. Committee members noted the proposed language was accurate.

Motion #11: Mr. Skaff made a motion, seconded by Ms. Toji, to send this section back to the staff for further revisions, for review by the committee on June 15, if possible, or as an alternative, to accept the proposed amendment after reviewing ADAAG.

Mr. Peterson clarified that the intent of the proposed amendment was to correct the percentage. Mr. Noble said these prescriptive hardship exception provisions were sent to the U.S. Department of Justice for review and comment, but a response has not yet been received.

Mr. Skaff said the hardship provision had been deleted from the language submitted to ADAAG. Mr. Scott pointed out the distinction between new construction and existing conditions, where exceptions are recognized. He questioned whether the committee should submit a new change at this point, and suggested deferring discussion of new issues until later.

A 10-minute recess was taken.

Mr. Scott reconvened the meeting and advised the committee that new amendments would need to be submitted as a separate process, and he urged committee members to focus on the changes identified by the staff.

Mr. Margen offered to make a motion to move this item forward. Mr. Scott suggested dealing with the pending motion.

Ms. Toji withdrew her second, and Mr. Skaff withdrew his motion.

Motion #12: Mr. Margen made a motion, seconded by Mr. Skaff, to send this issue back to staff for further review and consideration.

Mr. Peterson asked the staff to summarize the effect of the motion. Mr. Noble noted the current 2.5 percent is not accurate for the section as written. Mr. Skaff proposed sending the entire section back for further consideration.

The motion was carried, 5-1 (Mr. Peterson opposed, Mr. Guisasola absent during voting).

Mr. Scott recommended reviewing the remaining agenda items and considering postponing some items in order to continue with the code provisions.

Mr. Mankin urged the committee to make sure to address the policy changes on June 15.

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).

Mr. David Martinez, California Building Officials (CALBO), said his organization was particularly interested in the committee's action on Section 1117B.5, "Sign and Identification" issues; Section 217-P "Public Accommodation" definition under #1 for "hotel"; Section 1104B.6 "Religious Facilities", on Assembly Occupancies; Section 1117B.5 "Signs and Identification", regarding Finish and Contrast for Signs; Section 1117B.5.6, "Braille"; and Section 220-S, definition of "Story."

Ms. Huber observed that most of these issues were already part of the committee's substantive changes category.

Mr. Noel Nudeck said he needed to leave the meeting. He suggested deleting all future reference to the word "way." He noted "street sidewalk" would be "the sidewalk leading away from the street."

Mr. Scott advised that the committee was limiting its discussion at this point to the changes proposed in the meeting packet rather than new issues. He said Mr. Vester was keeping a list of new proposals to be addressed in the next code cycle or in DSA policies.

Mr. Gene Lozano asked if the committee would be discussing curb ramps and detectable warning requirements at transit boarding platforms. He noted that at the May 26 meeting, the committee asked the staff to do further research on this issue. He suggested it might be helpful to discuss all these issues at the same time. Mr. Scott proposed setting aside some time during the June 15 session. He said the committee planned to take up signs first thing in the morning, so curb ramps could follow after that.

Mr. Scott drew the committee's attention to the proposed amendments to Figure 11B-1A. He proposed changing the titles to "Single" or "Multiple Accommodation for Toilet Room."

Motion #13: Ms. Toji made a motion, seconded by Mr. Peterson, to change the title as proposed.

After some discussion, committee members decided in order to be consistent with the code, the new titles should be "Single Accommodation Toilet Facility" and "Accessible Water Closet Compartment within a Multiple Accommodation Toilet Facility."

Mr. Nudeck recommended checking with the ADA to verify consistency of terminology. Mr. Scott noted the proposed language harmonizes with the code itself and the accessibility section.

Ms. Toji modified her motion accordingly and the motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Scott noted the next change involves inserting "min." in the side elevation to designate the 36" and 42" grab bars.

Motion #14: Mr. Lawrence made a motion, seconded by Mr. Peterson, to accept the proposed change. The motion was carried unanimously.

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).

Mr. Scott drew attention to Figure 11B-21 "Return Curb Style", and noted the committee discussed modifying the figure so that the dashed rectangle is not aligned to the 48" dimension to avoid confusion.

Motion #15: Mr. Peterson made a motion, seconded by Ms. Toji, to accept the proposed amendment. The motion was carried unanimously.

With respect to Figure 11B-2B "Roll-in Shower", Mr. Scott recommended showing a similar dashed rectangle rather than a device.

Motion #16: Mr. Skaff made a motion, seconded by Mr. Lawrence, to accept the proposed modification. The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Scott noted the committee discussed placing the words "min. inside" and "max." adjacent to the numbers on the lines above. He also pointed out that the word "threshold" was being added to the lower diagram.

Motion #17: Mr. Skaff made a motion, seconded by Mr. Lawrence, to accept those changes to the diagram. The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Scott drew attention to Figure 11B-18A "Double Parking Stalls". He said the committee recommended an additional note to the words "no parking."

Mr. Skaff recommended specifying where and how the letters should be painted. For example, he noted the code should specify whether the letters can be angled, painted across hash marks, or have a solid black background.

Mr. Scott said the existing language does not specify contrasting letters on a solid black background, nor does it say the words must be painted within the first 36 inches of the leading edge of the access aisle.

He asked Mr. Skaff to draft appropriate wording for the committee's consideration the next day. Mr. Noble and Ms. Toji provided their email addresses so Mr. Skaff could send the draft language to them.

Mr. Scott said his notes indicated that all the other items pulled by the committee pertained to Section 1127B.5, "Curb Ramps", a topic that will be addressed by the committee after the signage issues.

Mr. Scott proposed going on to the substantive changes proposed for Section 217-P "Public Accommodation", dealing with # 1 for hotel and the definition of "Story."

Ms. Huber said her notes indicate the definitions up through "Public accommodation" were approved by the committee at the previous meeting.

Mr. Scott clarified that there were no changes proposed for the definition of "hotel", and asked Mr. Martinez to explain his concerns.

Mr. Martinez, CALBO, drew attention to Section 217-P, referring to # 1 "An Inn, Hotel, Motel, or Other Place of Public Lodging..." and the proposed new language in # 1 applying to owner-occupied small hotels. He asked if multi-unit hotels and bed-and-

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).

breakfast establishments with multiple buildings would be exempt. Mr. Martinez expressed his opinion that the proposed addition will cause confusion. Mr. Noble said the new language comes directly from ADAAG.

Mr. Margen commented that California does not need to adopt all provisions of the ADA. He said California already has restrictive provisions covering small hotels, but they do not include a requirement that the proprietor reside in the building. Mr. Margen read the definition of the facilities included in "public accommodation." Mr. Scott observed that the proposed language would make the requirements more restrictive.

Ms. Toji commented that the problem would be interpreting how the requirement would apply to owner-occupied properties that have multiple buildings. Mr. Scott pointed out that the word "facility" covers multiple buildings on one site. Mr. Margen read those provisions.

Mr. Martinez clarified that adding the language could lead to misinterpretations and confusion, and stated CALBO has concerns about enforceability.

Mr. Scott noted the committee already voted on this, so it would necessitate a revote to reopen this. He asked whether there were any motions for a revote, but no committee member responded.

Mr. Scott proposed going on to the definition of "Story" in Section 220-S.

Mr. Noble explained that the proposed amendment adopts the definitions of "Story" and "First Story" in the Health and Safety Code.

Motion #18: Mr. Lawrence made a motion, seconded by Mr. Margen, to accept the proposed change to Section 220-S.

Mr. Martinez pointed out that the proposed definition is slightly different than the definition in the current Uniform Building Code. He expressed concern that having different definitions for structural and accessibility purposes will cause confusion.

Mr. Margen noted the language did not seem very different. Mr. Noble said the UBC defines story as "that portion of a building," and the Health and Safety Code says "means that portion of a building."

Mr. Martinez said CALBO would like to see the UBC definition adopted. Mr. Margen expressed his opinion that the Health and Safety Code was more pertinent to access standards. Mr. Skaff agreed with Mr. Margen.

After some discussion, committee members decided the proposed amendment was appropriate.

The motion was carried unanimously.

Committee members took a short recess.

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).

Mr. Scott then drew attention to the document entitled "Revised Substantive Proposed Code Changes." He noted the committee had already accepted the changes proposed to Section 217-P "Public Accommodation".

Mr. Scott focused the committee's attention on Section 220-S, definition of "Stairway."

Motion #19: Mr. Skaff made a motion, seconded by Mr. Margen, to accept the proposed change.

Mr. Peterson spoke in opposition to the proposed change. He noted this requirement will mandate handrails, which will be a considerable expense and maintenance responsibility for schools.

Mr. Scott read ADAAG provisions regarding treads and risers under stairs. He expressed his opinion that single steps were tripping hazards, and that handrails should be provided along all stairways. Mr. Peterson pointed out that every single riser should not be considered a stairway.

Mr. Noble commented that the proposed revision codifies long-standing DSA policy.

Mr. Bob Nicol noted that by this definition, a curb could be considered a "stair." Mr. Noble explained that a curb would not constitute a "stair," but a walk with a single riser would.

Mr. Nudeck stated he did not support applying this requirement to a "walk with a single riser." Mr. Noble clarified that DSA approves walks with risers and stairs as part of ensuring an accessible route of travel.

Mr. Skaff pointed out that the proposed language defines a single riser as a "stair," which requires a handrail, and the issue really centers around handrails. Mr. Noble agreed with that assessment. He said the major issues are handrails, stair striping, and configuration of the nosing.

Motion tied, 3-3-1 (Mr. Scott abstaining).

Mr. Peterson commented that as recently as a few years ago, the code defined stairs as "more than two risers," and then the standard was modified to apply to two risers.

Mr. Scott suggested forwarding this provision to DSA for further review. He said he agreed with the DSA policy, but questioned the definition of "stairway." He added that he understood the problems on both sides of this issue. He asked the staff to convey the committee's opposing opinions on this matter.

Mr. Scott drew the committee's attention to the proposed changes to Section 1107A.4-D "Detectable Warning".

Mr. Lawrence recommended tabling the issue of detectable warnings until effectiveness and placement issues have been resolved.

Mr. Scott explained that "path of travel" has a special term-of-art meaning; he supported the change proposed by the staff.

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).

Motion #20: Mr. Skaff made a motion, seconded by Mr. Nicol, to continue using the “path of travel” language and reject the proposed change. The motion failed, 2-3-2 (Mr. Lawrence and Mr. Scott abstaining).

Mr. Scott asked the staff to convey the committee's differences of opinion on this issue to DSA.

Mr. Scott drew attention to the proposed change to Section 1104B.6.3, “Assembly areas.”

Mr. Nudeck confirmed that the provision would apply to street fair tents and stages. Mr. Scott clarified that wheelchair access is required under the ADA, and many jurisdictions will require compliance with ADA as a condition of granting an event permit.

Mr. Martinez said CALBO did not object to the addition of “and similar areas,” but had concerns as to whether the section was intended to apply to all assembly occupancies or just religious facilities. If it applies to all assembly occupancies, Mr. Martinez recommended renumbering and moving those provisions to another section, and committee members agreed.

Mr. Scott recommended clarifying what “similar areas” means.

Mr. Skaff proposed sending this section back to DSA for clarification regarding the intended applications. Mr. Margen agreed.

Motion #21: Mr. Skaff made a motion, seconded by Mr. Lawrence, to send the proposed change to Section 1104B.6.3 back to DSA for further review and clarification. The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Scott directed the committee's attention to the proposed amendment for Section 1115B.2.1.3.1 “Accessible Showers”. Mr. Noble explained that use of the proposed “adjacent to” terminology corrects a conflict in the code.

Motion #22: Mr. Skaff made a motion, seconded by Mr. Peterson, to accept the proposed amendment. The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Scott said the next change involves Section 1115B.2.1.3.3, “Accessible Shower...” establishing a 48-inch showerhead height rather than 40 inches.

Mr. Skaff expressed concern that 48 inches was too high for many disabled people. Committee members agreed that the staff should research whether the 48-inch standard would work.

Mr. Nudeck supported keeping the 40-inch standard.

Mr. Scott noted the diagram is inconsistent with the wording of the section. He proposed sending it back to the staff to be corrected so it is consistent with the Plumbing Code. He added that the new ICC ANSI standard is 48 inches maximum.

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).

Motion #23: A motion was made and seconded to send this section back to DSA for revisions. The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Skaff suggested asking DSA at the end of the June 15 session for the date when the revisions will be completed and disseminated. He recommended working with AIA and CALBO to make sure the new policies are disseminated to the people who need to know.

Mr. Scott drew the committee's attention to the proposed amendment to Section 1116B.1.9, "Car controls," adding the words "and symbols" to the note.

Motion #24: Mr. Lawrence made a motion to accept the proposed change.

Mr. Skaff recommended specifying white characters on a black background. Ms. Toji proposed requiring raised characters. Mr. Skaff proposed putting this item on the list of things to be reviewed in the future.

Mr. Skaff proposed amending the motion to accept the change proposed by DSA, and that the issue of requiring solid white raised characters be pursued as soon as possible.

Mr. Lawrence accepted this amendment, and Mr. Skaff seconded.

Mr. Scott clarified that the intent was to require that the color of the characters be integral to the material rather than surface-applied, and Mr. Skaff agreed.

Ms. Toji said she had a few minor editorial suggestions and typographical corrections to bring to the staff's attention. She offered to provide a list, and Mr. Scott suggested that the committee approve all her editorial changes as a group before concluding the June 15 session.

The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Scott drew attention to the proposed amendment to Section 1116B.1.10, "Hall Call Buttons". Mr. Noble reviewed the changes to the title and text.

Motion #25: Mr. Skaff made a motion, seconded by Mr. Peterson, to accept the proposed amendment.

Mr. Skaff commented that the elevator industry has reacted aggressively to oppose white light control buttons on elevator interiors, but they have accepted white light call buttons on the exterior. He suggested asking DSA to clarify the reasoning behind the proposal, and other committee members agreed.

The motion was carried unanimously.

Recess

Mr. Lawrence made a motion, seconded by Mr. Peterson, to recess until the following day, June 15, 2004, at 8:30 a.m. The meeting was recessed at 5:00 p.m.

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).

Reconvene and Introductions

Mr. Scott reconvened the meeting on Tuesday, June 15, 2004, at 8:40 a.m. He said the committee would be resuming its review of proposed changes to the California Building Code, Chapter 11B. He reminded participants to state their names before providing their comments.

Mr. Scott noted the committee would address signage first, then curb ramps and other issues. He proposed beginning the afternoon session with a discussion of the committee's task groups.

Participants took turns introducing themselves.

Mr. Skaff noted the committee decided on June 14 to review minutes of past meetings at the end of the agenda. He provided the staff with language he and Ms. Toji drafted in response to sections already reviewed.

Mr. Scott asked the staff to produce a combined set of meeting notes for the May 26, June 14, and June 15 sessions for the committee's review and approval at the next meeting.

Mr. Skaff requested that the staff make sure the minutes of the May 26 meeting reflect the exact discussion that took place during Mr. Mustacato's presentation. Mr. Scott noted the staff does not customarily include verbatim discussions in the meeting reports. He suggested that Mr. Skaff listen to the audio tapes of the May 26 meeting if he wanted more details. Mr. Skaff requested copies of the May 26 meeting tapes.

2004 Code Adoption Cycle - Express Terms and Statement of Reasons (Continued)

Signs and Identification - Section 1117B.5

Mr. Scott asked Ms. Toji to lead the discussion on the signage sections.

Ms. Toji directed the committee's attention to Section 1117B.5 and reviewed the proposed amendments. Mr. Scott suggested that each change be addressed separately.

Motion #26: Mr. Lawrence made a motion, seconded by Mr. Skaff, to accept the proposed changes to the title, re-numbering, the addition of the "s" to "Notes," and the addition of Note 2. The motion was carried unanimously.

Ms. Toji proposed changing the word "direction" to "directional" in # 2 and 4.

Motion #27: Mr. Scott made a motion, seconded by Mr. Peterson, to accept that change. The motion was carried unanimously.

Ms. Toji drew attention to the new text proposed for Item 4, "Plan Review and Inspection." She noted this language is being added in response to Senate Bill 1242.

Motion #28: Mr. Scott made a motion, seconded by Mr. Peterson, to accept the new language as proposed.

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).

Mr. Noble said Senate Bill 1242 requires DSA to develop regulations to ensure installation of tactile signage. Mr. Margen expressed support for the concept, but questioned whether this was the appropriate place in the code to specify enforcement procedures.

Mr. Peterson recommended inserting the word "Section" before the reference to "1134B.2.1" at the end of the sixth line and inserting a comma in the third line after "Section 1116B.1.15." Mr. Peterson suggested deleting the term "structural repair" from the sixth line.

Mr. Margen noted the "structural repair" language comes from the Health and Safety Code and the enabling legislation, so that term should not be deleted. Mr. Noble said "structural repair" is also used in Section 1134B.

Committee members discussed the types of work that would trigger signage and accessibility improvements.

Mr. Scott said he agreed with Mr. Margen that these enforcement provisions would be more appropriate in Chapter 1.

Mr. Noble noted the staff considering placing the language in Section 108, "Inspections," in an administrative section. However, because the language is specific to signage, staff concluded it would be better to put the language in the signage section. Mr. Skaff proposed inserting a reference to Chapter 1 or moving the provisions to the beginning of Title 24.

Mr. Margen said that after considering Mr. Noble's explanation, he would recommend leaving the provision in Section 1117B "Other Building Components".

Mr. Martinez said CALBO recommends tabling this item because of the potential costs and administrative impacts on local building departments and sign companies. He stated that CALBO would like an opportunity for its Accessibility Committee to review the matter further and develop a policy for implementation.

Mr. Margen said SB 1242 requires this now, so it is important for DSA to codify the procedure. Mr. Noble added that there was discussion about establishing a \$400 trigger threshold when the legislation was developed.

Mr. Skaff suggested that DSA look at the idea of approving prefabricated signs as a way of alleviating the time and expense of the permit process. Ms. Toji commented that most of the signs covered by the provision would be custom signs.

Mr. Lozano, California Council of the Blind, explained that SB 1242 was part of a compromise with CALBO, BOMA, and the lodging industry as a way of ensuring both installation of proper signs and enforcement. He said the provisions are intended to address the architectural aspects of the Braille signs and templates, not the Braille code itself. Mr. Lozano recommended approving the proposed language.

Mr. Bill Englund, Englund Designworks, commented that the new provisions are more procedural than code-related, and he expressed his opinion they should be moved to some other location.

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).

Mr. Englund noted the new requirements will impose additional costs for the inspection agency and the applicant. He questioned whether the local building official or the local fire department is responsible for enforcement. Mr. Englund also observed that the proposed language does not provide a variance procedure or means of resolving disputes.

Mr. Englund expressed concern about training inspectors so they can understand and interpret the requirements.

Mr. Englund noted the provision calls for inspection to take place after installation. He pointed out that compliance should be addressed before installation to avoid expensive repairs and revisions.

Mr. Englund also observed that the cost of inspection could be very substantial.

Mr. Scott thanked Mr. Englund for his remarks. He noted the chief building official's enforcement agency is clearly defined in the code. He added that variances and disputes would be handled the same way they are for other code issues.

Mr. Noble said SB 1242 also mandates DSA to develop a training program, and that process is underway.

Ms. Toji agreed with Mr. Englund that it would be most expeditious to do inspections in the plan check process prior to installation.

Mr. Ken Ethridge, architect, ASI-Modulex, commented that the proposed amendment appears to affect buildings leased and used by state and local government entities. He recommended clarifying the application up front.

Mr. Scott observed that the provisions apply to Title 2 entities under the ADA, not to Title 3 entities. He confirmed Mr. Ethridge's understanding that the provision would also apply to all other commercial and multi-unit residential projects. Mr. Mankin stated that this bill also covered leased spaces, and extends to "any public accommodation." Mr. Scott noted the requirement will eventually apply to all projects requiring a building permit with the exception of single-family residential.

Mr. Noble said DSA believes SB 1242 was only intended to apply to Title 2 entities. He noted the effect of the provision is to remove the 50 percent qualifier.

Ms. Toji stated the original intent, as presented to the senator who authored it, was that it would indeed apply to all buildings, Title 3 and Title 2. She noted the effect is simply to follow the law, which was commonly being ignored by designers, building owners, signage manufacturers, and by inspectors. She said the provisions spell out the need to follow ADAAG and Title 24.

Mr. Scott thanked Mr. Ethridge for his comments. He clarified the proposed language would apply to all state-owned and -leased facilities as well as any commercial or public accommodation. He noted the language simply spells out to architects and builders that accessible signage is required by code.

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).

Ms. Faye, Fayeworks Design, noted the intent of SB 1242 is relevant because it is cited in the rationale for the change, and she supported the idea of clarifying those requirements. Ms. Faye said signage plan checks have not been a normal part of the process; she recommended setting a dollar threshold for requiring a pre-check.

Mr. Lozano clarified that the intent of SB 1242 was not just to ensure adequate inspection, but to make sure they were installed and mounted as required by code.

Mr. Kyle Reath, Ellipsis, said the sign industry was most concerned about how the new process would work and what the impacts would be, especially on small projects. He supported the concept of setting a threshold to help control costs.

Mr. Reath endorsed the idea of interpreting ADAAG to remove accessibility barriers for the general public. He agreed that enforcement agencies should clearly spell out the rules in advance to avoid unnecessary expenditure of time or money. Mr. Reath said his main concern was making sure there were logical interpretations of building code provisions.

Mr. Reath recommended providing some kind of variance or appeal procedure to resolve code interpretation disputes.

Mr. Reath questioned whether there might be a conflict in interest in having a committee member representing a company that makes tools for inspectors. Mr. Scott said the committee has discussed potential conflicts of interest with all voting members.

Mr. Reath asked for an opportunity to participate with DSA in the code revision process. He recommended tabling this section until the issues are fleshed out.

Mr. Skaff said he was not comfortable allowing projects under a certain amount to be exempt from signage plan review. He pointed out that civil rights and access should be viewed as an across-the-board goal, not just a requirement for large projects. Mr. Skaff noted the purpose of having a plan checking and inspection process was to provide a certain level of quality assurance and compliance, and he questioned whether any dollar figure should be assigned.

Mr. Skaff supported the concept and recommended moving forward with it.

The committee took a brief recess, and Mr. Scott reconvened the meeting.

Mr. Peterson agreed that it would be helpful to set a threshold for plan review and inspection. He recommended inspecting the installation itself rather than verifying that each sign meets the requirements.

Mr. Skaff commented that building inspection and plan checking are the tools used by public agencies to ensure compliance. He noted the intent of applying this process to signage is to ensure a similar level of protection for the public.

Mr. Scott noted Table 1A lists permit fees ranging from \$1 to \$500, so the cost threshold issue may be moot.

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).

Mr. Mankin said DSA has not been reviewing the font and size of characters on a sign, so some critical issues have been neglected in the plan-check process. He advocated adopting the proposed language to clarify the requirements and make the process more predictable. He added that he believed a prescriptive approach was needed.

Mr. Scott noted the committee already approved the change from “direction” to “directional.” He said the other amendments include addition of a comma in the third line, adding the word “section” in the sixth line, and leaving the term “structural repair” in the provisions.

Mr. Scott amended the motion to include bringing the following issues to DSA’s attention: 1) the plan review process should determine the compliance of the application and quality of signs; 2) inspection should focus on the point of installation; 3) issuance of a certificate of occupancy is not be confused with temporary certificates of occupancy issued by the local building department; Mr. Scott added that signage should not be required for temporary certificates of occupancy; 4) DSA should develop a policy regarding a cost threshold; 5) training of DSA staff, inspectors, design professionals, contractors, and building professionals should be a high priority; and 6) DSA should develop a process for resolving disputes in the field.

As he seconded the motion, Mr. Peterson accepted Mr. Scott’s amendment.

Committee members elaborated on the six issues identified by Mr. Scott.

Mr. Skaff noted the inspection of signage should focus not just on the quality of the application, but also on whether the installation follows the approved plans.

Mr. Scott emphasized that the purpose of the amendment is to get DSA to address some of the important outstanding issues.

Ms. Toji explained that she would abstain because her company is involved in production of instructional materials. She noted her company was characterized by a previous speaker as a “manufacturer of Braille templates,” so she would abstain to avoid any appearance of a conflict of interest.

The motion was carried by a vote of 7-0-1 (with Ms. Toji abstaining and Mr. Guisasola absent during voting).

Ms. Toji drew the committee’s attention to the proposed amendment to Section 1117B.5.2, “Finish and contrast.” She said the purpose of the revision was to specify a 70 percent contrast standard and a measurement formula, a clarification sought by building inspectors.

Motion #29: Mr. Scott made a motion, seconded by Mr. Skaff, to accept the proposed amendment to Section 1117B.5.2.

Mr. Scott noted this issue was brought up at ICC ANSI, and the proposed language is more specific than what ICC ANSI adopted.

Ms. Toji said nearly all paint manufacturers test light reflectance values for their products, so the requirement will not pose a difficult burden. She added that

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).

independent verification is possible because Underwriters Laboratory can test materials for both light reflectance and glare.

Mr. Skaff recommended using the same kind of formula to determine contrast for curb ramp markings, and he asked DSA to look into that possibility. Mr. Nicol commented that this standard would also be helpful for stair tread markings.

Mr. Mankin emphasized the need to train plan reviewers, inspectors, and designers so they understand the implications of the change.

Mr. Scott accepted these suggestions as amendments to his motion.

Mr. Martinez, CALBO, supported the concept of providing training for plan checkers, inspectors, and architects. He noted the new provision will result in an additional plan-check item and additional materials, impacting both the inspection staff and applicants.

Mr. Ethridge, ASI-Modulex, spoke in opposition to the proposed amendment. He noted the same proposal was made to ANSI in 1998 and 2003, and it was rejected both times. Mr. Ethridge said that besides creating an administrative nightmare, setting a 70 percent standard rules out many colors that provide good contrast, including nautical blue and yellow. Mr. Ethridge stated he studied this issue extensively by testing visibility of different colors. He added that while 70 percent may have value as a target, it should not be specific as an absolute minimum. He urged the committee to reject this provision.

Ms. Faye, Fayeworks Design, noted that most signs are designed by graphic designers in the sign industry, not architects, so training architects will have little impact. She recommended including graphic designers in the discussion so their input can be considered.

Ms. Toji noted the ASI-Modulex Website recommends a 70 percent minimum contrast standard.

Mr. Ethridge clarified that the ASI-Modulex Website identifies 70 percent as a “useful recommendation.” He emphasized the point that 70 percent should not be considered an absolute, bright-line standard.

Mr. Peterson asked if there was an industry standard for contrast. Mr. Scott said he was not aware of an accepted industry standard.

Mr. Mankin noted courts have recognized “substantial compliance” as a 10 percent deviation from standard.

Mr. Scott amended the motion to include a recommendation that DSA define what constitutes substantial compliance. He proposed three recommendations: 1) that DSA provide technical assistance training; 2) consider requiring submittal of product, material, and paint color when issuing the building permit; 3) and that DSA determine what constitutes substantial compliance with the 70 percent standard.

Mr. Scott welcomed Mr. Guisasola to the meeting.

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA). The motion was carried by a vote of 8-0-1 (Mr. Guisasola abstaining).

The committee took a brief recess.

After reconvening, Ms. Toji directed the committee's attention to the proposed amendment to Section 1117B.5.5#4, pertaining to "Character Placement."

Motion #30: Mr. Scott made a motion, seconded by Mr. Lawrence, to accept the proposed amendment to Section 1117B.5.5#4.

Mr. Ethridge said he had no problem with the horizontal format and 3/8" minimum, but he expressed concern about the requirement that all Braille characters be "flushed left or centered." He recommended deleting that language.

Mr. Lozano explained that Braille readers scan raised print from left to right, so centering the text or flushing left facilitates the process. He supported adoption of the text as proposed.

The motion was carried unanimously.

Ms. Toji reviewed the change proposed for Section 1117B.5.6, "Braille."

Motion #31: Mr. Scott made a motion, seconded by Mr. Lawrence, to adopt the proposed amendment to Section 1117B.5.6.

Ms. Toji spoke in favor of the amendment to Section 1117B.5.6 "Braille". She said the underlying problem has been cylindrical dots with flat tops and straight sides, which tend to have sharp edges that snag a Braille reader's fingers, making the sign difficult to read.

Mr. Ethridge noted this standard was thoroughly discussed and accepted by ANSI in 1998 and 2003.

Mr. Stephen Moore, Ellis & Ellis Signs, asked what "rounded" means. Mr. Scott said that if a definition is not provided in the code, the standard dictionary definition is assumed.

The motion was carried unanimously.

Ms. Toji said she drafted proposed language for Section 1117B.5.7 "Mounting Location and Height". She recommended leaving the first paragraph as written, using the "latch side" terminology. She proposed adding the following note: "Signs that identify rooms and enclosed spaces are located on the approach side of the door as one enters the room or space. Signs that identify exits are located on the same side of the door as the visual exist sign."

Motion #32: Mr. Skaff made a motion to adopt the proposed amendment.

Mr. Scott noted the provision only applies to signs that identify permanent rooms and spaces, as indicated in the charging language. Mr. Skaff accepted this amendment.

**FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).
Mr. Scott seconded the motion.**

Mr. Ethridge suggested deleting some of the language near the end of the paragraph regarding exit signs and merely specify they should be on the occupancy side of a door.

Mr. Guisasola pointed out that occupancy could be on both sides of a wall. After some discussion, committee members recommended staying with the same side as the visual exit signs. Mr. Scott observed that the new language would apply only where a sign already exists.

Mr. Scott proposed the following addition: "Where permanent identification signage are provided for rooms and spaces, they shall be located on the approach side of the door as one enters the room or space. Signs that identify exits shall be located on the same side of the door as the visual exit signs."

The motion was carried unanimously.

Ms. Toji reviewed the proposed amendment to Section 1127B.3, "Signs," and Section 1133B.1.1.1.1, "Exceptions."

Motion #33: Mr. Scott made a motion, seconded by Mr. Guisasola, to accept the proposed amendments.

Ms. Toji said there have been numerous problems, resulting in unnecessary and expensive signage, because the word "junction" is unclear. She noted the intent was to require signs only at junctions between accessible and inaccessible routes, not at all junctions.

Ms. Toji proposed an amendment to Section 1133B.1.1.1.1: After the sentence, "Such doors shall have signs warning that they are not accessible," she recommended inserting, "and directing to the nearest accessible exit." Mr. Scott suggested adding this new language to the list of items for discussion later.

The motion was carried by a vote of 8-0-1 (with Ms. Toji abstaining).

Mr. Scott noted the committee previously approved the proposed amendment to Section 1116B.1.9, "Car controls," and recommended that DSA address the issue of surface-painted or integrally incorporated colors. Ms. Toji said she will provide some minor editorial revisions to the staff.

Mr. Scott noted this completed all the signage issues before the committee, and proposed moving on to discuss curb ramps and detectable warnings.

Curb Ramps and Detectable Warnings

Motion #34: Mr. Skaff made a motion, seconded by Ms. Toji, that the committee reconsider Section 1127B.5, "Curb ramps." The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Scott reviewed the proposed changes. Committee members recommended further discussion of the beveled lip, the detectable warning location, alignment, size of truncated domes, and spacing.

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).

Motion #35: Mr. Lawrence made a motion, seconded by Ms. Toji, to accept the proposed amendments, with the exception of the items pulled for further discussion. The motion was carried unanimously.

Motion #36: Ms. Toji made a motion, seconded by Mr. Peterson, to approve the sentence saying, “Curb ramps shall have a detectable warning surface.”

Mr. Peterson noted a detectable warning surface on a curb ramp would not necessarily mean a hazardous vehicular area, and he expressed concern about confusing people. Mr. Mankin pointed out the intent is to protect pedestrians in a shared parking area.

Mr. Lozano stated that parking lots can be dangerous to people with impaired vision. He said changes in elevation may not be sufficient to alert people when they are approaching vehicular traffic, so detectable warnings would be helpful.

Mr. Greg Moore, Golden State Vanguard, agreed with Mr. Lozano and Mr. Mankin that detectable warnings protect pedestrian safety in parking lots.

The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Mincer said the term “curb ramp” needs to be distinguished from “curb cut.” Mr. Scott stated that a task group has been established to help resolve issues such as this.

Committee members looked at the proposed locations of detectable warning surfaces and how they are measured.

Motion #37: Mr. Peterson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Lawrence, to recommend that detectable warning surfaces be located a minimum of 6 inches and a maximum of 8 inches from the curb line.

Mr. Noble read the definition of “curb line.”

Committee members suggested including the definition in the code, and Mr. Peterson and Mr. Lawrence accepted the amendment.

The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Mankin recommended specifying that detectable warnings should be aligned with the direction of travel rather than diagonal.

At 12:00 noon, the committee recessed for lunch. Mr. Scott reconvened the meeting at 1:15 p.m.

Mr. Scott suggested that the committee discuss the task groups and policy changes, and then return to the issue of truncated domes.

UDC Task Groups

Mr. Vester reported that he, DSA Advisory Board Chair Lowell Shields, and Mr. Scott discussed the task groups and agreed on several key points. First, he said, formation of task groups would be a joint decision of the committee chair, Board chair, and State

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).

Architect. He noted the committee currently has two task groups, one chaired by Chris Lawrence regarding door opening force, and another chaired by Pete Peterson regarding play areas.

Mr. Vester said participation in the task groups will be strictly voluntary, and DSA will not be able to reimburse members for their expenses in attending task group meetings, except for UDC members who attend the discussions.

Mr. Vester stated that the staff can make accessibility arrangements to accommodate participants. However, he urged the participants to avoid using teleconferences whenever possible and to communicate informally by writing or e mail through the staff, Mr. Scott, or task group chair.

Mr. Vester noted task groups will be treated much less formally than committees. He suggested keeping open rosters and taking notes of meetings. He recommended following Robert's Rules of Order and complying with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. Mr. Vester pointed out that task groups will not be taking votes, but will be making recommendations on a consensus basis. He said there was no need to record meeting sessions or keep official minutes.

Mr. Vester stated that task groups are ad hoc entities formed in response to issues identified by the State Architect or by the Universal Design Committee. He recommended establishing a specific charge, description of deliverables, and a timetable for each task group. He encouraged the task groups to brainstorm, conduct research, and report back to the UDC with proposed solutions. He added that task groups will be dissolved once they complete their assigned tasks.

Mr. Vester said the chair of each task group must be a member of the Universal Design Committee. He recommended not limiting the size or composition of the task group.

Mr. Vester encouraged the task groups to work with the UDC chair to formulate agendas for each meeting. He asked that copies of the agendas be provided to the staff in sufficient time to provide adequate public notice, which must be posted no less than 10 days prior to the meeting date.

Mr. Vester suggested appointing one or more DSA technical staff to attend task group meetings and monitor their activities.

Mr. Vester proposed that the UDC set task force meeting dates, and he offered the staff's assistance in finding meeting locations. In order to maximize efficiency, he recommended setting back-to-back task force meetings.

Mr. Vester said he planned to present these points to the Board for endorsement at the June 18 quarterly meeting.

Mr. Scott asked Mr. Lawrence and Mr. Peterson to develop draft agendas for the next task force meetings. He recommended developing a strategic statement of the task group's goal, a schedule, and a target completion date.

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).

Mr. Vester advised the task groups to defer their next meetings until August. In the meantime, he suggested that task group chairs can distribute materials and develop a proposed agenda.

Committee members asked about restrictions on e mail communications. Mr. Vester encouraged task group members to disseminate materials through the staff. He said participants can have one-on-one conversations with others, but not serial meetings. Mr. Scott asked participants to refrain from broadcasting emails to multiple recipients at the same time.

Mr. Vester noted the Attorney General's office has a summary of the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act and guidance as to its application. He offered to provide copies to committee members.

Mr. Scott thanked Mr. Vester for the update.

2004 Code Adoption Cycle - Express Terms and Statement of Reasons
Curb Ramps and Detectable Warnings (Continued)

Mr. Scott drew attention to Section 1127B,#7.

Mr. Lawrence drew attention to the seventh line, and proposed inserting "with the direction of travel" between "aligned" and "in a square grid pattern."

Motion #38: Mr. Lawrence made a motion, seconded by Mr. Peterson, to accept inclusion of the new language.

Committee members discussed the implications of recommending a specific path alignment. Mr. Lozano said he believed the intent was to be in line with the run of the ramp. Mr. Skaff discussed the U.S. Access Board's language regarding alignment. Mr. Lawrence proposed "in line with the slope of the ramp in a square grid pattern." Mr. Peterson accepted this language.

The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Scott noted the next issue concerns the dimensions of truncated domes. He read the proposed language for that section.

Motion #39: Mr. Peterson made a motion, seconded by Ms. Toji, to accept the language proposed.

Mr. Lozano expressed concern about the detectability of the proposed truncated dome pattern. He noted research into variations of the dome diameter and spacing shows that smaller domes are more detectable than larger domes and are easier to negotiate. He recommended retaining the small diameter of .9" and .45," as is currently in Title 24, and center-to-center spacing in the range of 1.66" to a maximum of 2.35". Mr. Lozano pointed out that these dimensions were consistent with public right-of-way guidelines and have been in the code since 1994. Mr. Skaff confirmed there are materials in the marketplace that meet all these requirements.

Mr. Noble stated that the proposed standard matches the technical standard in the Public Right-of-Way Guidelines used by FHWA.

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).

The motion failed, 2-7 (Mr. Skaff and Mr. Margen in favor).

Mr. Scott drew the committee's attention to Section 1116B.3, regarding "Elevators and Special Access (Wheelchair) Lifts". He said the proposed amendments correct the way the provisions were drafted before, and the exceptions are specified elsewhere.

Mr. Scott observed that the change was not substantive.

Motion #40: Mr. Scott made a motion, seconded by Mr. Guisasola, to accept the proposed amendment.

Mr. Lawrence asked whether the provision was intended to address stages and other non-viewing areas. Mr. Scott responded that the language would not apply, because those facilities would have to be provided with a means of egress. He said this language recognition of wheelchair lifts as an alternative. He added that the provision addresses problems created by stadium seating.

The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Scott drew attention to Section 1133B.8.3, regarding "Detectable Warnings at Transit Platforms". He recommended repeating what the committee did regarding curb ramps.

Motion #41: Mr. Scott made a motion, seconded by Mr. Lawrence, to make the proposed revision. The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Scott reviewed the proposed changes to Section 1129B.2 "Less Than Five Spaces" for accessible parking required. He noted that when there are less than five spaces, the requirement is being changed from a 14' to a 17' wide space, with an adjacent 8-foot access aisle. Mr. Scott said the intent of the provision is to provide a van-accessible space, consistent with ADA requirements.

Mr. Noble said the current ADAAG does not provide this signage exception, although this provision is being proposed for the next version. He clarified that the committee tabled this section previously in order to check the revised ADAAG language.

Mr. Skaff expressed his opinion that signage should be required.

Mr. Margen cautioned about making modifications to the current code that go below existing ADAAG standards. He expressed support for changing the size of the space, but said he had reservations about the exception for less than five spaces.

Motion #42: Mr. Skaff made a motion, seconded by Mr. Margen, to send this provision back to DSA to be modified to meet the existing ADAAG.

Mr. Guisasola pointed out that if the van space dimensional requirements are not addressed, they are unlikely to be addressed until some point in the future. He noted it would be simpler to proceed with the DSA language, along with a recommendation to add signage.

**FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).
The motion passed, 4-5.**

Mr. Scott asked the staff to point out to DSA the lack of consensus on this issue.

Motion #43: Mr. Peterson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Lawrence, to approve the proposed amendment to Section 1129B.2, and recommend that DSA look into the issue of ADAAG consistency. The motion was carried, 7 - 2 (Mr. Margen and Mr. Skaff opposed).

Mr. Scott drew attention to the proposed amendment to Section 1129B.4, regarding "Parking Space Size". He noted there was a correction to metric measurements, a minor correction, and a minor renumbering.

Motion #44: Mr. Lawrence made a motion, seconded by Mr. Peterson, to accept the proposed amendment to Section 1129B.4.

Mr. Skaff asked if the issue of striping was part of the motion. Mr. Scott noted striping would be considered separately.

The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Scott recommended addressing the issue of the "no parking" sign on Figure 11B-18A "Double Parking Stalls". Mr. Skaff said he and Ms. Toji developed some language. He recommended requiring the "no parking" lettering to be visible to traffic enforcement officials. Mr. Scott said the code already requires that. Ms. Toji agreed.

Mr. Skaff proposed the following: "The 12" high 'no parking' lettering be required to be painted within the hatched loading zone of accessible parking spaces shall be located at the leading edge, toward the back of the vehicle, closest to the vehicular way behind the vehicle, and shall be painted in line with that leading edge, not at an angle. The background of the area, other than white 'no parking' lettering, must be a solid black, non-glare color for the greatest contrast. The hatch lines within the rest of the loading zone area shall not be painted within the solid black background area." Mr. Skaff also recommended adding, "and located so that the 'no parking' is visible to traffic enforcement officials."

Motion #45: Mr. Skaff made a motion, seconded by Mr. Mincer, to accept the language proposed by Mr. Skaff.

Mr. Margen expressed concern about introducing a new color to the issue of parking. He suggested thinking of alternatives other than a black background.

Mr. Skaff noted signs with blue backgrounds are not visible enough.

Mr. Margen commented that it might be possible to achieve the same purpose in another way, such as posting a sign marking the area as "no parking" and "access aisle." He recommended referring the section back to DSA.

Mr. Scott expressed his opinion that the proposed language was not suitable for code. He recommended not approving it.

**FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).
The motion failed unanimously.**

Mr. Scott drew attention to the proposed editorial correction to Section 1133B.5.2.2, "Entrances and Special Occupancy"; changing "or" to "and."

Motion #46: Mr. Lawrence made a motion, seconded by Ms. Toji, to accept the proposed amendment. The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Scott noted this completed the committee's review of the code changes. He suggested moving on the policies.

DSA Policies Proposed for Deletion

Motion #47: Ms. Toji made a motion, seconded by Mr. Peterson, to accept the policy deletions proposed by DSA. The motion was carried unanimously.

Proposed New DSA Policies

Mr. Scott proposed taking the new policies separately.

04-01 - Beveled Lip at Curb Ramps

Motion #48: Ms. Toji made a motion, seconded by Mr. Mincer, to approve the proposed policy eliminating beveled lips at ramps. The motion was carried unanimously.

04-02 - Detectable Warnings

Mr. Noble said Policy 04-02 removes the 1: 15 horizontal slope requirement that did not allow detectable warnings on curb ramps. He noted Item 1 specifies a square grid in-line pattern, and Item 2 deals with size and spacing.

Motion #49: Mr. Scott made a motion, seconded by Ms. Toji, to accept the proposed policy, with the addition of other changes made by the committee in the area of detectable warnings. The motion was carried unanimously.

04-03 - Visual Alarms in Classrooms

Mr. Noble said this policy responds to the State Fire Marshal's interpretation that classrooms do not require visual alarms. The proposed policy clarifies that DSA requires visual alarms in new construction.

Motion #50: Mr. Margen made a motion, seconded by Mr. Skaff, to approve Policy 04-03 as proposed. The motion was carried unanimously.

04-04 - Travel Distance to Accessible Sanitary Facilities

Mr. Noble reviewed the proposed policy for taking travel distance into consideration in determining which sanitary facilities are deemed accessible.

Motion #51: Mr. Guisasola made a motion, seconded by Ms. Toji, to approve Policy 04-04 as proposed.

Mr. Peterson expressed concern about how the policy would apply to a complex of buildings on school grounds.

FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).

Mr. Noble clarified that the requirement was no more than 200 feet beyond the nearest inaccessible facility.

After some discussion, the committee decided to send this policy back to DSA.

New Business

Mr. Scott noted two UDC members need to depart for the airport and suggested the meeting be adjourned.

Adjournment

Mr. Scott suggested setting the next meeting date for the UDC after the June 18 DSA Advisory Board meeting and thanked everyone for attending.

There being no further business, Mr. Peterson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Lawrence, to adjourn the meeting. The meeting of the Universal Design Committee was adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

Summary of Follow Up Items:

1. Committee to approve minutes of the 5/26, 6/14 & 6/15 meetings at the next UDC meeting.
2. Staff is compiling materials for Committee members' binders.
3. Mr. Vester is keeping a list of new proposals to be addressed in the next code cycle or in DSA policies.
4. Staff to provide Committee with copies of the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act.
5. Staff to provide Mr. Skaff with a copy of the May 26 UDC meeting tapes.
6. The following items were sent back to DSA Technical Staff for further review. (Please refer to each motion and discussion included in the minutes for details):
 - a. (Motion #9), Section 1116.1.8, "Car Inside." Note: DSA staff revisited and corrected and included it in this year's package.
 - b. (Motion #12), Section 1133B.7.1.3, "Surface Cross Slopes". Note: DSA staff revisited this and included 4.16% gradient in this year's package.
 - c. (Motion #21), Section 1104B.6.3, "Assembly Areas". Note: Follow up for consideration in next year's code submittal package.
 - d. (Motion #23), Section 1115B.2.1.3.3, "Accessible Showers". Note: Follow up for consideration in next year's code submittal package.
 - e. (Motion #42), Section 1129B.2, "Less Than Five Spaces for Accessible Parking Required". Note: This was included in this year's amendment package. See Motion #43.
 - f. (Regarding motions, where noted DSA technical staff conveyed the

**FINAL UDC Minutes of 6/14/04 & 6/15/04 (Approved w/ exception of 2 issues where recommendation on proposed code was not accepted by DSA).
committee's differences of opinion to management).**